

56
A TEMPERATE EXAMINATION OF HOMŒOPATHY.

No. 2.

THE
PRINCIPLES OF HOMŒOPATHY,

WITH A FEW HINTS ON THE

Nature and Cure of Disease.

BY

W. BRAITHWAITE,

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS, AND LECTURER ON THE DISEASES
OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN THE LEEDS SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

(REPRINTED FROM THE 40TH VOLUME OF "BRAITHWAITE'S
RETROSPECT OF MEDICINE.")

LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.

LEEDS: D. I. ROEBUCK, PRINTER, 14, TRINITY STREET;
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1860.

Price 4d., or 50 for 10s.

No. 1.—“ON THE DOSES AND PROVINGS OF HOMŒOPATHY,”

2nd Edition, may be had, price 2d., or 50 for 6s.

No. 3.—“ON THE STATISTICS OF HOMŒOPATHY,”

Is intended to be published in June next.

THE PRINCIPLES OF HOMŒOPATHY,

WITH A FEW HINTS ON THE

NATURE AND CURE OF DISEASE.

In our last volume we endeavoured to explain "The Doses and Provings of Homœopathy." We will endeavour in this, our 40th volume, to point out the *Principles* of Homœopathy, and show that these principles are inconsistent with the true principles and practice of medicine, and dangerous to be trusted to when applied to the healing of diseases. We wish to examine this subject in a fair and temperate way, so as, if possible, to convince even the homœopaths by fair and simple arguments, how inconsistent their principles are with the modern science and art of medicine. We wish also to say that we only state our own views, which may probably differ from the views of numerous other medical practitioners. If any one, therefore, see fit to answer this pamphlet, let it be done by fair argument, and in a proper spirit, by keeping to the point, and not by flying off to other questions.

In our last pamphlet we asserted that the homœopaths used what are called dilutions in mixing their medicines, and that each dilution was represented by adding two ciphers to the original unit. Thus, the first dilution of a drop or grain was the 100th; the second dilution the 10,000th; the third, the 1,000,000th; the 20th, the 100,000,000,000,000,000,000th; and the 30th, or decillionth, the 1,000th part of the original drop. We endeavoured to show that the Atlantic Ocean does not contain a decillion of drops, and that the physician might just as well drop a drop of laudanum or any other medicine into the sea, and, after being *well mixed*, take a few drops out and give them to his patient.

You frequently see in homœopathic writings that the *billionth* of a drop was used. What is a billion ?—a million times a million. No man could count a billion. If you counted two hundred in a minute,

this would be 12,000 in an hour, 288,000 in a day, and 105,120,000 in a year,—it would take 9,512 years, at the above rate of 200 a minute, to count a billion ! And yet this is only the 6th dilution used by homœopaths, viz., the 1,000,000,000.000th of a drop or grain. Some, however, will dilute their drugs to the decillionth part of a drop. This no one will or can deny. It is a fact which any one who reads their writings may prove for himself. No man, we say, can count a billion ; much more difficult would it be to count, or even to comprehend a *decillion*. We give the following figures, which will show the various dilutions of homœopathic medicines, so that they who practice this art may know at once how much of the original drop of medicine is contained in the mixture which they are giving or prescribing :—

Decillion. nonillion. octillion. septillion. sextillion. quintillion. quadrill. trillion.

1,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,

billion. million.

000000,000000,000000.

Now this puts the practice in so absurd a light, that the homœopaths try to get out of the dilemma in all kinds of ways. Some say they do not depend on doses : others say that these infinitesimal doses are rendered powerful by *shakings* and *triturations*. Hahnemann believed that infinitesimal division of drugs produced a real *spiritualization*. “ Long trituration,” he says, “ if carried very far will make the drug *quite ungovernable*.” In another place he says, “ by the succussion and trituration employed a change is effected in the mixture, which is so *incredibly great*, and so *inconceivably curative*, that this development of the spiritual power of medicines to such a height by means of the multiplied and continued trituration and succussion of a small portion of medicinal substance deserves incontestibly to be reckoned among the greatest discoveries of this age.”—(*Lesser Writings*, p. 818.) But this, if possible, is outdone by Dr. Mure, who is described as the “ Apostle of Homœopathy.” The disciples of his school were obliged to subscribe to the following article :—“ I believe that all substances in nature, even those regarded as the most inert, possess the power of acting on the vital dynamism, because all contain a *spiritual principle* which they derive from God.”—(*Brit. Journ. of Homœopathy*, vol. vii., p. 535. See *Dr. Simpson's Work*, p. 23.) We think it must be this *vital dynamism* which is alluded to by Dr. Craig in his late pamphlet ; but as he has only slightly alluded to this extraordinary power, we hope that he cannot hold such a foolish theory. He writes, however, of the “ *dynamic or vital agents*” with reference to homœopathic medicines, in such a way that one cannot wonder that those who call themselves *Homœopaths*, “ incur (as he confesses) the enmity and ridicule which the very name provokes.”

Another mode of accounting for the power of drugs, or rather another mode of communicating power to them, is by *Infection*. Hahnemann, in his ‘Lesser Writings,’ says, “ Thus much is deducible from

Korsakoff's experiments, that, since a single dry globule imbibed with a high medicinal dynamisation, communicated to 13,500 unmedicated globules, with which it is shaken for five minutes, *medicinal power fully equal to what it possesses itself*, without suffering any diminution of power itself, it seems that this marvellous communication takes place by means of proximity and contact, and is a sort of *infection*, bearing a strong resemblance to the infection of healthy persons by a contagion brought near or in contact with them."—(*Lesser Writings*, p. 859.) We need make no comment on this extraordinary theory. We leave every man of common sense to think as he likes of it.

The way in which other homœopaths defend the infinitesimal dose system is sometimes curious. One of their best writers is Dr. Dudgeon. In one of his letters, in defending the infinitesimal doses, he says, "Calculate the quantity of matter you leave on the ground in a five-mile walk, which shall reveal your track to your sagacious dog; the weight of the musk conveyed in an odorous billet that shall make a sensitive lady faint; the quantity of ipecacuanha that escapes from an uncorked bottle, that shall give some idiosyncratic individual a fit of asthma; the weight of the odour from a rose, that was wont to make an eminent cardinal swoon; the cubic contents of a fit of anger that shall give your irascible neighbour the jaundice," &c.—(*Med. Times*, 1850, p. 605.) We cannot perceive that this is any argument to prove the value or efficacy of an infinitesimal dose of laudanum. You *can* divide a drop of laudanum, so as to get the 100,000,000,000,000,000,000th, or the tenth dilution, but how can you *weigh* or *divide* a *smell* or *odour*, or *measure* a *fit of anger*? The thing is ridiculous; and very ridiculous to defend infinitesimal doses in such a way. And even if you could *weigh* a *smell*, we suspect the cause and effect would correspond, in the same way that the light of a star, which we see at an immense distance, corresponds exactly to its size, distance, and quantity of light. There might be a little more argument in Dr. Dudgeon's illustration, if he had previously proved, as facts, that the dog had traced his master from New York, when his master was at that moment on the Rocky mountains; or, that the ipecacuanha escaped from a bottle at Bombay, and gave the asthma to a member of his family in his own comfortable house in England; or, that the odour of the rose was emitted from Peking, and struck down with its odour the cardinal at Rome. But even these effects would be insignificant when compared with the effects of the 100,000,000,000,000,000,000th of a drop of laudanum in disease.

Now that the modern homœopath has got himself into the ridiculous dilemma about his small doses, he begins to *back out* of this difficulty, and to say that the *principles* of his creed have nothing to do with small doses, that he can give any doses he likes without violating his principles. It is true that the *principles* of a science are very different from the *practice*, and that the principles can be worked in different ways, either well or ill: for example, a sailor may work the principles

of astronomy very badly, and wreck his ship ; another may work them well, and arrive at his port safely. So one homœopath may work his principles by small doses, and another by large doses, and although each may work his principles well or ill, neither may really violate his principles. But how is it, when the homœopaths repudiate these ridiculously small doses—such as the 1,000,000,000,000th (billionth) of a grain or drop of *cocculus in colica menstrualis* ; or the 1,000,000th (one millionth) of a grain of *ipêcacuanha* ; or the 10,000,000th (ten millionth) of a grain of *belladonna* ; or the 1,000,000th of a grain of *bryony* ; or the 100,000,000th of a drop of *aconite* ; or the 100,000,000 of a grain of *phosphorus*—that *these are the very doses used by Dr. Fleischmann in the Vienna Hospital*, on whose reports the homœopaths lay so much emphasis, and spread these same reports far and wide as specimens of success ? Here we can convict the homœopath of throwing dust into our eyes. He says, “We do not depend on these ridiculous doses,” and in the next breath he says, “Look at the success of homœopathy in the Vienna Hospital—we cure more cases than the allopath by our mode of treatment !” The contradiction in these two assertions would be very unlikely to be found out, except by one who examined the medicines and doses used by Dr. Fleischmann. We have done so, and found out that the so-called cures were said to have been performed by the doses we have just mentioned. We assert, therefore, that whatever the homœopaths may say to the contrary, *they do give and do depend on these ridiculous doses*, however they may deny this to the public. We must look to their published writings for an explanation of their practice, and not to what they say privately. Even our friend, Dr. Sharp, of Rugby, in his pamphlets, frequently alludes to these infinitesimal doses, and says that he himself most frequently uses the *one-millionth* of a drop, but has seen good effects from the 1,000th of a grain or drop. When we occasionally heard it asserted by the homœopaths, that these doses had nothing to do with the principles of homœopathy, we at once referred to their practice in the Vienna Hospital, and found the cases almost invariably treated by infinitesimal doses. We were, therefore, greatly surprised that the homœopaths repudiated, in a great measure, these small doses, and in the same breath extolled their good effects. (The only excuse we could find for this contradiction was, that they had not studied their own *statistics*, and merely took for granted what other people said.) The reader will find a full report by Dr. Balfour of numerous cases treated in the Vienna Homœopathic Hospital by Dr. Fleischmann, in the *British and Foreign Medical Review* for October 1845, p. 567, in which report the dilutions of nearly all the medicines used are accurately noted. Amongst numerous other cases, catarrh and bronchitis were treated with the 100,000,000th of a grain of sulphur, and with 1,000,000th of a grain of *aconite* ; spasm with the 1,000,

000,000,000th (billionth) of a grain of *ignatia*, once daily. We could go on multiplying these instances, but we have said enough to show that, when a homœopath denies or repudiates these ridiculous doses of medicines, he is not supported in his assertions by the best writers of his own school; they are nearly all against him. The Principles, therefore, of homœopathy, and the Practice, are necessarily two distinct things; but the practice of homœopathy, nevertheless, is based on the most ridiculous and absurd doses of medicine ever invented: and now that the thing is exposed, the homœopath is beginning to be ashamed of it himself. To such an extent is the infinitesimal dose system carried by some, that Dr. Balfour states, that in Vienna “one practitioner often contents himself with allowing his patient to *smell* the remedy, waiting patiently for some weeks or so, for the completion of the cure, not even permitting a second smell.” Habne-mann, we are told, did the same: and one lady, “having been subjected to this process, *passed the fee before the doctor’s nose*, and then—replaced it in her pocket.” (*Dr. Lee’s Homœopathy*, pp. 7, 8.)

Our chief object in this pamphlet will be to examine “The Principles of Homœopathy:” but, before doing so, we will first explain a little more at large than we had room for in our last pamphlet, our objections to the way in which the homœopathists endeavour to spread their doctrines, and endeavour to gain an advantage over regular physicians and surgeons. We blame no one for differing from us in opinion, but we do blame any man for endeavouring to spread his opinions in such ways as the homœopaths adopt.

It has been one of our greatest pleasures for the last twenty years to take almost daily notice of the progress of medicine in the various medical works which have been published. We have generally omitted noticing the *errors* of our fellow practitioners, for obvious reasons; at present, however, we must deviate from our general rule, and notice some of the errors both of doctrine and practice which have crept into our ranks. We shall endeavour to do this in a temperate way, so that none may find fault with us on this head. If a little humour or ridicule occasionally escape, we hope that people will take it in good part. We shall mean nothing ill by it; our object will be chiefly to defend our noble, humane, and scientific profession from assaults which have been lately made against it, more in a rude than in a scientific and gentlemanly way.

Few sciences or arts have more improved than has the Science of Medicine within the present century. But its career has been silent, and unobserved, except by the medical practitioner. We need not refer to the various improvements in the practice of Surgery, such as operations on the eye; restoring lost parts, such as the mouth, the palate; amputation of limbs; taking out diseased joints and joining the limbs together again; curing club-feet and all kinds of deformities; treating aneurism, by compressing the artery and without tying it; curing hernia radically, so as to save the use of a truss, and prevent

the risk of strangulation ; operating on the strangulated hernia without opening the sac ; and innumerable other improvements, which every well-informed surgeon is aware of. We will more particularly refer to the improvements in finding out and treating internal diseases, and then ask if the modern science of Medicine deserves the “nick-name” sometimes given to it of “the old system.” In our opinion there are no sciences or arts more *new* or modern. The modern practitioners of medicine by no means go by the old ideas, which are sometimes unjustly quoted by homœopathic writers in disparagement of living practitioners. Among modern improvements we may enumerate our increased knowledge in all diseases of the nervous system, viz., delirium of all kinds, convulsions, and paralysis ; diseases of the chest, which, by the modern improvements in auscultation we can accurately distinguish the one from the other, foretelling from the nature of the sounds the progress of the disease, and its results to the patient ; diseases of the kidneys, which have become much more clearly understood by means of chemistry and the microscope ; diseases of the liver, which, by the microscope and testing the urine, we can much more accurately define ; diseases of the blood also have become more intelligible and amenable to treatment, besides many others which we have not space here to mention. Whatever homœopath, therefore, alleges against the modern practice of medicine, that it is the “old system,” is evidently no reader of modern books, but of old ones. He is being left behind by his reading competitors, and trusts to the knowledge which he has picked up in days long gone by, when a young student under what he would call “the old school.”

If he had even turned to one of our last Retrospects, vol. 38 and 39, published only twelve and six months ago, he would have found numerous articles by different writers, in nearly every one of which there is some new and improved idea and method of treating diseases. He would have found something new on Cancer, Rheumatism, Scarlatina, Myalgia, Neuralgia, Tetanus, Nævus, Asthma, Diphtheria, Pneumonia, Diabetes, Uric Acid or Gravel, Chloroform in Labour, the Womb, Ovarian Dropsy, Diseases of Women, Carbonic Acid as an Anæsthetic, with numerous other very interesting observations. If, moreover, he will turn to the present and several preceding volumes, he will find recorded *every year* nearly 300 suggestions and some decided improvements in the theory and practice of medicine, by various authors,—some very valuable and remarkable improvements.

We mention this, in order that the public may give due credit to the progress of medicine, and not be led away by homœopathic writings which attempt to mislead people to suppose that scientific medicine is at a *stand-still*, whilst the homœopathic system is said by them to be advancing. We shall see as we go along, whether it be honourable and decorous in homœopathic writers perpetually attempting to impress upon people that theirs is the *new system*, whilst ours is the *old system*. We have been particularly struck with this unjust nick-

name given to regular physicians of high character and long success in their particular localities ; and we would recommend the homœopath, if he wishes to gain any respect, to depend on his own knowledge, and not to make reflections of an injurious and unjust character on gentlemen not to be surpassed in practical knowledge and success.

It is another great mistake to call a regular, or rational, or scientific practitioner of medicine, an *allopath*, or *antipath*. It is another *nick-name*, which no right-minded man ought to give to another. The homœopath has given himself his own name, and therefore he must take it ; but there is no such person as an *allopath* or *antipath* in regular practice. Allopathy, which we shall use in preference to antipathy, includes the method of opposing nature in her efforts, but this is not true of any one. Another mistake made by homœopaths, and a more discreditable one cannot be made, is to depreciate other medical men in the estimation of the public, by attempting to throw discredit on the practice of medicine adopted by other people, always excepting themselves—after picking holes in other people's coats and making them as ragged as possible—they adroitly display themselves in their own new dress. We have been particularly struck with the way in which they have made extracts from the writings of regular physicians, nearly always selecting their candid confessions of failure in certain cases, and never exhibiting the other and brighter side of the question, viz., where they have succeeded ; or perhaps they have selected passages from books so as to make the science of medicine as objectionable as possible, but the inaccuracy of which the unprofessional reader cannot perceive. What would be thought of a clergyman, educated at Cambridge or Oxford, and having received his degree and honours there, and been ordained by his Bishop,—who seceded from the church, and not only stated that there was no way of salvation within her pale, but who took every opportunity (although still possessing, and being proud of, his degree of A.M., or D.D.) of finding all sorts of fault with the college education, the principles taught, and the religion entertained ; especially if his abuse of others was suspected to add to his own pecuniary advantage,—would he not be *cut* by his former associates ? Or what would be thought of a provision dealer, if he issued placards and advertisements that he had found out an improved method of preparing flour, that all the flour in the town, except his own, was adulterated with an inferior article, and moreover contained poison in large doses,—would he not also be *cut* by his fellow tradesmen ? So it is in our profession. We find no fault with people entertaining different opinions ; but when we see all kinds of ways of making invidious distinctions between themselves and others, mixing their medicines in particular ways so as to be something *new*, publishing and asserting that regular physicians exhibit medicine in large and poisonous doses, with various other ways of gaining notice, we think it derogatory to a respectable and learned profession.

But it is particularly unfair, and untrue, to allege that regular physicians employ strong poisons as medicines, and give such large doses that the constitutions of their patients become injured,—whereas they, the homœopaths, give such small doses, that all this danger is avoided. We must assert that all this is a system of proceeding highly discreditable.

We could *disgust* every one of our readers by telling them of some of the remedies which some homœopaths use. But we consider that these remedies are used only by some, and can be no proof of the general practice of the body. We should not think, therefore, of using these prescriptions in an argument against homœopathy neither is it fair in the homœopaths to pick out some of our most objectionable old prescriptions from old books, and bring them forwards as specimens of what they call the *old system*, without at the same time candidly telling the public that this kind of practice has long since passed away from the ranks of all well educated surgeons and physicians. As an illustration of the way in which the practice of regular physicians is shown by the homœopaths, you have only to turn to the pamphlet of Dr. Horner, of Hull, who states at p. 5,—“Vegetable drugs, as aloes and colocynth, which had been administered even *some years* before, remained deposited in the system, producing a miserable and wholly shattered state both of mental and bodily health.” But this is outdone by Dr. McLeod, of Benrhydding, Ilkley, who states, that “Such drugs as aloes were extracted tangibly and washed out of the compresses that had encircled the body: it also made the patient’s room offensive with the distinct vapour of aloes.” (*Dr. Horner’s Pamphlet*, p. 53.) This is really too bad! We naturally read a little further, expecting to find the next wonder to be that this vapour of aloes had been condensed and again made into the identical family pills which the unfortunate patient had been swallowing; and that they were actually to be seen exposed as a curiosity in one of the windows of Benrhydding!

The medicines employed by modern physicians and surgeons are not to be called poisons; for when poisonous medicines, such as arsenic, opium, belladonna, aconite, mercury, &c., are used, they are prescribed in such small doses that they no longer act as poisons. It does sometimes happen, that medicines act more energetically than was anticipated, but this is a rare exception; and it is wrong to take these rare exceptions and spread them before the public as the rule. The object of the homœopathists is, we are sorry to say, a very discreditable one: it is evidently to excite the fears of people that they are always taking poisons when attended by regular surgeons and physicians—a very wrong idea indeed, but one which we feel certain they are anxious to propagate. The public, however, may rest satisfied that the modern system of medicine in the regular ranks of the profession, is to do with as *little*, and not with as *much* medicine as possible; with as *mild*, and not with as *strong* medicines as possible. The reader has only to

refer to the writings of Dr. Sharp, of Rugby, if he wishes to be convinced of the truth of these remarks. Amongst other things, he will find in one of his Tracts, a *wood engraving* to illustrate the way in which hot irons are prepared to be applied to the patient in surgical cases! This engraving would remind one of the tortures of the Inquisition; but how unworthy to exhibit these things to the public in order to excite their fears and prejudices. Why cannot a respectable man, like Dr. Sharp, whom we have known for thirty years, make use of fair argument, without first attempting to damage his opponents in public estimation. We might think it excusable in Morrison, Dr. Coffin, and such like men, but for respectable and well-educated men to do this is highly unworthy.

Another objectionable practice of the homœopaths is to publish Statistical Tables, which, if not incorrect, are at any rate so placed before the public as to mislead. For our own part, we think that most statistical tables may be fallacious, except those of the Army and Navy, which must be the most correct of any statistics of this kind which are published. The error of these homœopathic tables is at once seen by reference, for example, to the Statistics of the Leeds Infirmary. One homœopathic writer, Dr. Craig, of Leeds, asserts that the per centage of deaths in all diseases in Homœopathic hospitals is 5.8 per cent., while in Allopathic hospitals it is 12.4 per cent. Moreover, this writer, in a feeble attempt to answer our first pamphlet (but which is no answer at all,) publishes this error at the end of his pamphlet, together with his account of the officers of the London Homœopathic Hospital, all of which had nothing to do with what he was writing about, but were placed there in the way of display. If this said writer had examined the Report of the Leeds Infirmary for the last year, he would have found the following figures: "Patients admitted since 1767, 247,911; cured, 165,639; died, 8161; relieved, 30,723." So that we have about 8161 deaths out of 247,911 patients. We make this account to give 3.2 per cent. of deaths; but making allowance for mistakes, we think that we may calculate about 4 per cent. of deaths, *and not 12.4, as Dr. Craig asserts!* We believe all the hospitals of Great Britain will not average much above 5 per cent., including all accidents and dangerous surgical cases. One of the most dangerous operations on the human body is cutting for stone. The average per centage of deaths after this operation is only about 13; so that, if every patient admitted into all the hospitals of Great Britain and Ireland had been cut for stone, as many would have recovered as Dr. Craig makes out from common and ordinary diseases.

We are quite aware that it is difficult at all times to arrive at a correct conclusion respecting Hospital statistics, if we include out-patients. It is very possible in such an hospital as Fleischmann's Homœopathic hospital, at Vienna, for the cases to be selected, as

we know to be the case. In general hospitals, such as the vast hospitals of Vienna and Paris, only the *worst* cases, both medical and surgical, are selected for admission, often quite incurable from the commencement. It is obviously unfair, therefore, to calculate the per centage of deaths among the *in*-patients and exclude the *out*-patients; both *in* and *out* patients ought to be reckoned. But here is the difficulty; it is easy to calculate how many die, or are cured in the hospital, but it is not so certain when we refer to the *out*-patients. The calculation of the Leeds Infirmary is of both *in* and *out* patients as near as could be made. The statistics of some of the hospitals of Vienna, Paris, and London, and indeed of all *in*-patients of hospitals, show a much higher per centage of deaths, for the reasons which we have stated, but we repeat that this is not a fair calculation. It only respects the cases which are selected *as the worst* which apply for relief, and generally excludes the milder *out*-patients; we believe, however, that taking the whole together, and including all accidents, and surgical operations, the average will not be above 5 or 6 in British Hospitals. In our next pamphlet we will endeavour to calculate this as well as we can. Such an institution as the Leeds Public Dispensary, is, perhaps, as good an example as can be used to show the per centage of all kinds of cases, good and bad, medical and surgical. These cases are prescribed for in the institution, and the bad cases are visited at their own homes, so that the register of deaths must be pretty accurate. We find in the report for 1858 the following figures:—"Patients admitted since 1824, 111,100; cured 90,156; greatly relieved 5750; died 4476." This gives us 4.02 per cent. of deaths, a very different thing from what the homœopathists would wish the public to believe. Dr. Craig further carelessly states, that in Homœopathic hospitals only 5.7 per cent. die of inflammation of the lungs, while 24 out of every hundred die in Allopathic hospitals. We only request Dr. Craig to examine one of the last official Army returns for the Colonies. Of 12,271 cases of inflammation of the lungs, he will find that only 413 died; this is about 3 per cent., and in some cases only 2 per cent., i.e. less than *half the number* which Dr. Craig himself acknowledges die in Homœopathic hospitals! What, therefore, can the public think of Dr. Craig's statements? In our last volume is an interesting paper on lithotomy, abstracted from the lectures of Mr. S. Smith, of the Leeds Infirmary: out of every 8 cases operated upon for stone, only one has died: this gives us about 13 per cent. If this gentleman had operated for stone on all the 247,911 patients admitted into the Leeds Infirmary for the last 93 years, he would probably have had no more deaths than what Dr. Craig says take place from common diseases.

We requested Mr. Blakelock, the Secretary of the Leeds Infirmary, to calculate the per centage of deaths in that institution, and the following is his letter to the author:—

LEEDS GENERAL INFIRMARY,
November 5th, 1859.

"My Dear Sir,—According to your desire I have calculated the average per centage of Deaths occurring amongst the patients of the Leeds Infirmary. The whole number of patients admitted during the 93 years which have now elapsed since the foundation of this institution has been 252,937, amongst whom there have been 8276 deaths, giving an average of 3.27 per cent. During the first 12 years, the average mortality was 5.1 per cent. During the last 12 years, it has been 3.33 per cent. The very slight increase of the last figures over the general average is accountable for by the great mortality which occurred after operations during the summers of 1852, 53, and 54. It must be borne in mind that these figures include a large number of deaths from serious burns and mill accidents, many of the patients dying within a few hours of admission. If these could be excluded, the mortality would be still further reduced. No register is kept of the number of patients admitted for each disease separately, so that the per centage of deaths in pneumonia cannot be ascertained. I, however, find that only four patients are entered in the death-book as having died from pure pneumonia during the last four years.

"I am, dear Sir, very truly yours,

"SAML. BLAKELOCK, Secretary.

"W. Braithwaite, Esq."

We think this statement of Mr. Blakelock's highly creditable to the officers of this noble Institution, and will be gratifying to its numerous subscribers. We hope also that it will silence the attempts of certain individuals in Leeds to cast reflections on the modern practice of medicine. We wish and hope that it may also gratify them; but of this we are more doubtful. We are afraid they would have been better pleased to have had it proved that the practice had been very unsuccessful, and that 12 out of every hundred had died instead of little more than three. We are aware, that in all the hospitals at Vienna, *there is very great fatality*, amounting probably to what Dr. Craig states. Why does he not candidly tell the truth to the public, and acknowledge that these tables do not refer to the hospitals of Great Britain, nor to the Army and Navy. Why does he leave the public to believe that our own hospitals are included in these statistics?

We will now give the reader the words of Hahnemann on the real principles of his creed, and proceed to make some remarks on this question.

"A weaker dynamic affection is (says Hahnemann) permanently extinguished in the living organism by a *stronger one*, if the latter, whilst differing in kind is similar to the former in its manifestations." Again, "All the rapid and perfect cures that nature ever performed are always effected by the supervention upon the old disease of one of a *similar character*."—(*Organon*, p. 165.) And hence he says "for this mode of procedure (by Homœopathy) we have the example of

unfettered nature herself, when to an old disease there is added a new one similar to the first, whereby the one is rapidly and for ever annihilated and cured." (p. 175.) "The stronger disease annihilates the weaker." (p. 145.) In another place, he says "In order that the artificial diseases producible by medicines may effect a cure, it is before all things requisite that they should be capable of producing in the human body an *artificial disease as similar as possible* to the disease to be cured, in order, by means of this similarity, *conjoined with the somewhat greater strength*, to substitute themselves for the natural morbid affection, and thereby deprive the latter of all influence upon the vital force." (p. 133). In order to accomplish the end above described, certain medicines are to be chosen which will produce *symptoms as similar as possible to the disease to be treated*. The homœopathic mode of treatment therefore is that "in which there is employed for the totality of the symptoms of the natural disease, a medicine capable of producing the *most similar symptoms possible* in the healthy individual." (p. 175.) But in order that this medicine should be efficacious and more powerful than the disease, it must at first, for a longer or shorter period, produce an *aggravation or exaltation of the symptoms of the disease*, and not their relief or abatement. The disease indeed ought to be made worse at first. The drug must first produce "a medicinal disease somewhat *stronger or greater* than the malady to be cured." (p. 237.) In other parts of his work, Hahnemann says "The similar artificial diseases excited by medicines are stronger than the natural disease." The physician "produces a disease very similar but *stronger*" than the natural disease. "The curative power of medicines therefore depends on their symptoms, *similar to the disease*, but superior to it in strength." (p. 126.) So that a disease can be removed "solely by one that is similar *in symptoms* and is somewhat *stronger*, according to the eternal, unchangeable laws of nature." (p. 151.) So that in a severe, dangerous, and rapid disease in which life depends on the next few hours, and any increase of which disease must *necessarily* be fatal, the symptoms ought at first to be increased in severity. A homœopathically selected remedy, Hahnemann observes, "usually, immediately after ingestion, for the first hour or *for a few hours*, causes a kind of slight aggravation (where the dose, however, has been somewhat too large *for a considerable number of hours*) which has so much resemblance to the original disease that it seems to the patient to be an aggravation of his disease. But it is in reality nothing more than an *extremely similar medicinal disease*, somewhat *exceeding in strength* the original affection." (p. 237.) Hahnemann further says that "the sum of all the symptoms in each individual case of disease must be the *sole indication*, the sole guide to direct us in the choice of a curative remedy." (pp. 119, 120.) "By the removal of the whole of the perceptible signs and symptoms of the disease the sum total of the disease is at the same time removed." "It must be the *symptoms alone* by which the disease

demands and points to the remedy suited to relieve it, and, moreover, the totality of these its symptoms must be the principal or sole means whereby the disease can make known what remedy it requires, the only thing that determines the choice of the most appropriate curative agent, and thus, in a word, the *totality of the symptoms* must be the principal, the *sole thing* the physician has to take note of in every case of disease, and to remove by means of his art." (p. 113.)

Now, when we read the above principles of homœopathy, we are struck with two or three remarkable fallacies which might mislead any one who had not studied the nature of disease. The great error in these principles is to mistake symptoms for disease, the effects for the cause. A patient has a violent pain in the face, it is called tic-doloureux—the cause of this is a decayed tooth. The symptoms are the tic, the cause is the tooth. Another patient has a violent headache, or dizziness from a loaded stomach—the headache is merely the symptom, the cause is the loaded stomach. To treat the pain in the face by giving medicines which would resemble tic, would be called an empirical mode of treatment, *i.e.*, treating only symptoms—to extract the tooth would be eradicating the cause. To treat the headache in the same empirical way would be nonsense, but to unload the loaded stomach would be treating the cause radically. Another great error in the above dogmas or principles of homœopathy, consists in generating a more powerful set of symptoms similar to the disease, in order to overcome the original disease. This is a dangerous error, and may account for the startling fact, that the homœopaths seem to have considerably more deaths, according to their own acknowledgment, than regular surgeons and physicians, if we may judge from the statistics of the Leeds Infirmary.

In order, however, to discuss this question properly, it will be necessary for us to explain in as familiar a style as we can what are the *modern views of disease*, which are gradually becoming better known; and also what we mean by a *principle*. As we go along, the reader will better understand how the homœopath mistakes a principle for an art, and a disease for a symptom. The following ideas on the nature of disease are explained in a familiar style, and some of them may be deemed not satisfactory by the profession. We acknowledge that the subject is a difficult one, and that all have a great deal to learn on this question; and we think that the day is not distant when this very interesting subject will be worked out more clearly. It is very probable that our opinions may be much criticised by some of our professional friends. This we are prepared to meet with: but our object is not only to show the errors of homœopathy, but to endeavour to point out where, in our opinion, the true principle of medicine exists. We shall endeavour to show that in most, if not all diseases, there are, 1st, The disease itself; 2ndly, the effects and *necessary* symptoms or consequences of the disease; and 3rdly, another and quite different set of symptoms, *which are not always nor necessarily con-*

nected with the disease, and which are the *efforts* of *nature*, either too strong or too feeble, or just right, to rectify the disease. The error of homœopathy consists in simulating and even aggravating the second class of symptoms, or those which are *necessarily* connected, and sometimes said to be *identical*, with the disease. The object of Modern Scientific Medicine is to regulate the third class of symptoms.

What, then, is Disease? It is on the definition of this important question that most of the errors in practical and theoretical medicine have arisen. It is in ignorance of the nature of disease that the system of homœopathy has arisen. It is this ignorance of disease which induces the homœopath to treat *symptoms* of disease instead of the disease itself. In this consists his great mistake, as we shall endeavour to show; but in attempting to point out this mistake, we shall be compelled to make some preliminary remarks, in a familiar style, in such a way that the public may understand us. These remarks would be quite unnecessary to educated medical men, but we must remember that pamphlets of various kinds have been distributed by the homœopaths to the public, which seem very plausible, but which, in our opinion, are very unsound both in argument and facts.

It is alleged by the homœopath that the scientific or regular physician has no principles to guide him, but that in homœopathy there is a certain and infallible *principle*. A *principle* means a *truth* which is unerring. A stone is thrown up into the air, and it invariably falls down, owing to the principle or truth of gravitation. We have always day and night, owing to the *principles* of astronomy. To be a real principle, it must never fail. If homœopathy be founded on a true principle, it ought never to fail—all its cases ought to recover if treated properly, and if they do not recover it is owing to their having been treated improperly. If you point your ship to New York by the guide of the magnet it will surely arrive at the spot: it will not sometimes arrive at New York, and at other times at Halifax—it will never fail you. If you arrive by mistake at Halifax instead of New York, either your magnet is wrong, or you have not followed its principle. If the homœopath says he has found out a true principle of medicine, but frequently fails in his cases, either the principle is wrong, or he has mismanaged it. If he answer that the principle is right, but that circumstances occurred which prevented him following it, we should say that the principle is not worth much if it be not trustworthy in a storm as well as a calm. If the sailor tells us that he arrived at Halifax by mistake instead of New York on account of the storms, we should say that his magnet must have been of very little use. He was obliged to manage his ship according to circumstances, and to trim his sails according to the storm; his *principle* of navigation was of comparatively little use—his *art* of sailing was of more use, and his *art* preserved his ship from destruction.

We consider that the whole practice of medicine depends on an accurate knowledge of what is *Scientific* in its principles, and on how far

Art can carry out, or work on, these principles. We can best illustrate our definition in a few words by pointing out that the *art* of navigation is founded on, or the working out of, the *principles* of *astronomy* and the *magnet*. The sailors of old had few or no principles to guide them; they navigated their ships from Greece to Italy, or from Tyre to Carthage, by the *art* of navigation chiefly. They understood the position of the stars, and the sun and moon, and these were their chief guides, but they depended also on the shores and mountains along which they passed. Astronomy was in its infancy, and the magnet was not known. Navigation, in fact, was an *art*. By and by, however, the magnet was discovered—its principles were found certain and infallible, it could not mislead. The sailor could now boldly plunge his ship across the Atlantic with unerring course; his *art* became founded on a *science*, or a *principle* which was infallible. His art might vary in the following of this principle, but he always kept his magnet before him. The man at the wheel was steady at his post, although the sailors were busy with the sails. The man at the wheel was guided by a *principle*, the sailors during the storm were guided by an *art*. The principle or science could not vary; the art might vary according to every direction of the wind. So it is in the *science* and *art* of medicine. The *science* of medicine is difficult to discover; it is only just now beginning to be seen. The *art* of medicine has long existed, but only as an *art* founded on experience.

One great error which has blinded the minds of medical men in observing the true principles or science of medicine is in confounding *symptoms* of disease with the *disease itself*. Thus, a man has a bit of dirt in his eye, perhaps a bit of sharp sand blown on his cornea by the wind; he cannot displace it himself—what occurs? The eye begins to inflame, and looks red and angry; inflammation comes on and the eye looks *diseased*. But is this disease? No; it is only the *symptom* produced by the bit of sand—the sand, in fact, is the real disease, and the inflammation is nothing more than an effort of nature to get rid of the bit of sand. The inflammation (i.e., the falsely-called disease) in short is a *conservative process*. It proceeds somewhat as follows: the blood rushes to the spot where the bit of sand is imbedded with such force that the blood-vessels around it are completely *clogged up*, or blocked up with red blood-corpuscles. You might as well have sent a whole army of red-coated cavalry at a gallop to pass at full speed along the Strand, or through Temple Bar blocked up by an omnibus,—they cannot do it, they are stopped by the narrowness of the street, which becomes more and more narrow, till it ends in the omnibus blocking up the gateway. They come to a dead stand, although the soldiers in the rear are still pressing on. The crush becomes so severe that the soldiers in advance are at last so jammed up that they *perish*. It is somewhat similar with the red blood which is jammed up all round the bit of sand—the blood perishes, and the parts immediately around the bit of sand die also: being dead, they

lose all hold of the living parts, they decay and drop off, but in doing so they bring away the bit of sand, and thus rid the eye of the source of irritation. The hole is then filled up by new and living structure, and the eye is perhaps no worse for the process. But the whole thing illustrates what we should call *the wonderful processes of disease*. In short, we cannot look upon it as disease at all. We perceive the same thing occurring all through the animal economy, although the source of irritation may not be a bit of sand, but some other foreign body, or poison, or depraved or perverted secretion, or excretion—such as the poison of fever, gout, rheumatism, and many other diseases. Instead of the bit of sand in the eye, suppose that the source of irritation is a quantity of sand in the blood, called gravel or lithic acid. Now the kidneys are the great cleansers or depurators of the blood. Their office is to keep the blood free from certain things which get into it, and which otherwise would impair and even destroy its usefulness. Amongst other things, lithic acid or gravel is frequently formed in this blood, and the kidneys set to work to get it away. But they often fail in doing this work, and the acid accumulates in the system. What is to be done? The skin would be willing to do its part to take it off, but the patient is unwilling to go through the exercise in the open air to enable the skin to act, and it refuses to act whilst the patient remains in the arm-chair or study; so the joints or the great toe come forward and offer to do the work, much to the joy and relief of the kidneys. The toe inflames and swells, and at last gets well. The patient is now quite relieved, and is better than he has been for months. He has been relieved of some *peccant humour*. This you will find deposited round the joint of the great toe. It is swollen: cut into it if the patient will consent to the experiment, and you will find the sand, which just before was in the blood, and making the man ill; it is in the form of a chalky product, (lithic acid combined with an alkali), which could be detected in the blood previous to the attack, but which has now disappeared from the blood, and found a place of rest round the toe. The same kind of irritation is found in several other parts of the body, especially in what are called mucous and serous membranes, which are evidently doing their best to assist the kidneys in their work. But do you call this *disease*? We call it *a wonderful vicarious process by which nature is attempting to get rid of something which is vitiating the blood*. The *symptoms* of gout are not the disease; the disease is that which is poisoning the blood. We at once attempt to cure, not by producing *symptoms* by means of medicine as similar to those of gout as we can, but by exercise, and fresh air and diet, and also by giving alkalies, such as potash, which destroy the acid in the blood. We do not give medicine to simulate the pains of gout or rheumatism, but to counteract the poison at its source; just the same as in the eye we pick out the bit of sand, so in gout we pick out the sand in the blood, which we cannot do with a lancet or needle, but which we can do with

alkaline medicines, which act remarkably on the acid which causes gout.

We are attempting now to illustrate the error of mistaking *symptoms* for what is called *disease*, and the error which runs all through the system of homœopathy, of pretending to generate a set of symptoms, which may be common to diseases of the most various kinds. We may have similar symptoms, very difficult to distinguish from each other, in functional diseases of the nervous system, and in those which are more inflammatory; in diseases which require good diet, and in those which require low diet; in diseases, in short, whose *symptoms* are alike, but whose treatment ought to be quite dissimilar and opposite.

Quite different diseases cause symptoms exceedingly alike. These diseases are not only quite unlike each other, but require quite different treatment. Now it is clear that, on the homœopathic principle, if you can by means of medicine, generate similar symptoms to a given disease, this medicine is the remedy. But how can it be the remedy for the two different diseases of worms in the bowels, and Bright's disease of the kidney? By referring to a paper in this volume, page 61, by Dr. Heslop, Professor of Medicine, Queen's College, Birmingham, the reader will find a description of the symptoms of worms, as connected with the nervous system. We find, amongst other symptoms, "pale complexion, obstinate headache, general neuralgic phenomena, senses dulled, skin dry, thirst, &c." Dr. Heslop then says, "There is the strictest similitude between the cerebro-spinal symptoms of some forms of Bright's disease and those attendant on worms—particularly the tape-worm. So close is this likeness, that in cases where I should otherwise have predicted the presence of worms, my mind has been suspended in doubt, until after the urine had been subjected to scrutiny." It is well known also that worms will produce other symptoms, such as of whooping cough, convulsions in children, hysteria with violent jactitations or profound repose, sudden insensibility without convulsions, violent laughter—all of which symptoms are relieved by getting rid of the worms. M. Wawruch, of Vienna, has noticed 206 cases of tape-worm. The following is his summary of symptoms:—"Dull pain in the forehead, giddiness, buzzing in the ears, dulness of the eyes, dilated pupils, emaciation, alternate loss and excess of appetite, cravings for particular articles of food, itching of the nose and arms, grinding of the teeth, &c., &c." Now, on the homœopathic principle, Bright's disease of the kidney ought to be treated by medicines which produce nervous symptoms, similar to worms; and worms ought to be treated by medicines which will produce nervous symptoms, similar to Bright's disease of the kidneys! But the regular physician goes to the root of the matter at once, with respect to the worms; instead of producing similar symptoms, he gives medicines which get rid of the worms, and the symptoms cease. A child or woman who had been treated homœopathi-

cally for such symptoms as are caused by worms, might go on for ever in this way without relief; whereas a single dose or two of turpentine, or kousso, or male fern, might relieve the symptoms at once. Every candid homœopath must at once see the force of this argument, which could be continued in numerous other cases. The argument may be summed up in a few words, thus—Where two or more diseases of diametrically opposite natures have particular symptoms almost exactly resembling each other, and yet are acknowledged to require quite *different* modes of treatment, it cannot be correct to treat them both in *the same way*, by generating symptoms similar to each. This is only one example amongst numerous others, of the unscientific and even absurd practice of treating symptoms, instead of the disease which causes those symptoms.

To assist nature to throw off a disease, does not consist simply in giving a medicine which in health would generate symptoms similar to the disease. This is a curious and serious mistake, which might appear plausible in some instances, but which in other instances would be foolish. For example, a man is attacked by a common cold. Now what are the *symptoms*? Shivering, or a cold skin, running from the nose, sneezing, &c. Now if you give medicines which in health would generate similar symptoms, you do not assist nature in curing the case; but if you have observed how, in another case, nature has cured, viz., by perspiration, &c., and if you thus imitate her, and generate a symptom which does not belong to the case, and which, in fact, is no symptom of a cold at all (perspiration), you easily cure your patient. We merely use this simple illustration, which might be extended to numerous other examples, to show that to give a medicine which will, either in health or disease, generate symptoms similar to a disease, is a very unscientific method of following out nature's mode of cure. Take another example, which, however, can only be understood by medical men, but which, we hope, the homœopathic physician will candidly consider. We allude to a case of disease of the mitral valve of the heart. The disease is in the valve of the left side of the heart; the blood is either obstructed in its course forwards, or is thrown backwards, and thus regurgitates. What are the symptoms? The peculiar systolic bellows murmur, most distinct towards the axilla, difficulty of breathing, lividity of the skin, intermittent pulse, a bilious or yellowish skin, with scanty and high-coloured urine. Now, let the homœopath try to generate such like symptoms in a healthy man, and then give the medicine in this case in order to cure or relieve his patient. Let him give a medicine which, in health, would cause difficulty of breathing, blueness of the skin, intermittent pulse, a yellow skin, or scanty urine, and see if he can relieve his case. He will utterly fail. On the other hand, what is the way in which nature will sometimes endeavour to relieve all this venous congestion? The secretions from the bronchial surfaces become loose and copious, mucus is copiously expectorated, bile finds its natural outlet into the

bowel, watery purging may come on, and the kidneys, being relieved of their congestion, begin to secrete urine. Now all these are not symptoms of the disease, for they may exist in many other dissimilar diseases. They are no more symptoms of the disease than the perspiration was a symptom of the cold. They are the efforts of nature to relieve both *the disease and the symptoms*, and we can assist her very materially. Give a single grain each (provided the urine is not albuminous), of calomel, digitalis, and squill, to act on the bronchial surfaces, the liver, and the kidneys, to be repeated occasionally either with or without the calomel, and at the same time give what is called a watery purge, composed of a little jalap and cream of tartar in a large quantity of cold water, or a small dose of Epsom salts in cold water, and you will relieve the patient in a rapid and extraordinary manner. The object is to relieve the venous congestion which exists all over the body, and you can accomplish this by very simple means, and almost always with success. We have here a beautiful example of the way in which the physician can assist nature—not by increasing or generating or simulating *symptoms*, but by imitating the way in which nature would relieve the patient if she could, and the way in which she does sometimes succeed. Let us, therefore, study these beautiful laws of relieving disease. Let us take nature, or the way which the Almighty has pointed out to us, as our example, and not violate her teachings, as is the way of some, or simply trifle with them, as is the way of others.

The common symptom of disease called vomiting, will serve again to illustrate how fallacious it would be to treat a *symptom* of a disease for the disease itself. A patient may be affected with vomiting from numerous causes; he may have taken too much, or improper food; or his stomach may be inflamed, so that it will not bear the contact of food; or the man may be seized with a fit of syncope (fainting); or he may have a disease of his brain, near the origin of the nerve which supplies the stomach with the power of movement; or he may have water or pus form in, or upon his brain; or, if in a female, she may have disease or something wrong in the ovaries or uterus. All these things may cause the same symptom which may be the most prominent symptom in the case; but simply to allay the vomiting, would not be to cure or treat the case. To treat these different diseases homœopathically, you must give a medicine in proper doses which, in the healthy man in certain other doses, would cause vomiting, such as ipecacuanha; but, to treat disease of the brain in this way, would be a most dangerous nullity, it would be simply trifling with the case. Or, to treat a case of vomiting or sickness in the female by simply attending to that symptom, and neglecting the uterine or ovarian irritation, would be trifling with the feelings of the woman; and to simulate this irritation or disease of the womb or ovaries by giving medicine, would be not only impossible but absurd. Or, if the vomiting depended on cancer of the pylorus, or on pressure of the

left portion of the liver on the outlet of the stomach, would it not be equally improper to give medicine to simulate the symptoms, and impossible to give medicines to simulate the disease pylorus or liver? We mention these things in passing, which ought to shake the confidence of the firmest believer in homœopathy, and make him suspect that his principles are erroneous and dangerous, when relied upon in the treatment of a disease. He may thus be led away to treat symptoms only, and entirely to neglect the disease which gives rise to those symptoms.

A very interesting and a very decided proof that the principles of homœopathy are erroneous, is the effect of the Woorara poison as an antidote to strychnine and a remedy for lock-jaw. This virulent poison, which is used by the Indians to poison their arrows, has been used successfully on the human subject in a case of lock-jaw or tetanus, by M. Vella, in the Military Hospital at Turin, during the late Italian campaign. He dissolved two grains in nine drachms of water, and applied this solution to the wound which caused the lock-jaw. This remedy produced a complete relaxation of the muscles. It is a direct sedative of the motor nerves, and an antidote not only to lock-jaw produced by disease, but also to strychnine, which causes symptoms almost exactly similar to lock-jaw. This will be seen by referring to Dr. Harley's paper in the *Lancet* for 1856, vol. 1., pp. 619, 647, and in our *Retrospect of Medicine*, vol. 34. p. 30. Here we have a remedy, the effects of which we can see and appreciate at once—a remedy directly allopathic, or antipathic, producing symptoms not like, but as unlike as possible, to the disease. Lock-jaw, or tetanus, *tightens* or *contracts* muscles; Woorara poison relaxes them.*

It is on the same principle that we can often, by remedies, rapidly cure an attack of asthma; take the following case reported by Dr. Salter:—"A poor woman was brought into King's College Hospital, supposed to be dying, quite unable to move or speak from the violent action of the respiratory muscles. The suffocation was of the asthmatic kind. I at once administered chloroform. After a few whiffs, the spasm began to yield. *In ten minutes after entering it she left the hospital well.*" (*Brit. Med. Jour.* Oct. 1, 1859, p. 794.) Now here is another case, in which we can see and appreciate the effects of a remedy. The woman is attacked with an affection in which the nerves and muscles of respiration are in a high state of excitement, almost amounting to spasm, and a direct sedative which relaxes spasm is given to her, and acts instantly. It is the same as if a man was tightening a rope by pulling it, and some one instantly laid hold of the same rope and *slackened* or relaxed it. The homœopathic principle would be to tighten or stretch the rope in order to relax it, (which in fact is a ridiculous Irishism); but when you want to relax it, is it not better to do it at once? In both tetanus and asthma, the muscles or ropes of

* For an account of the treatment of tetanus [in the Turin Hospital, see *Lancet*, Oct. 1, 1859, p. 245, and to the 40th (the present) vol. of our *Retrospect*, p. 37.

the body are in a high state of spasmodic tension, and we have valuable remedies to relax them very rapidly. Even the effect of ipecacuanha in asthma and vomiting, which is so dwelt upon by some homœopathic writers, is quite misunderstood by them. Ipecacuanha and antimony act as powerful sedatives of muscular action, and relax both the muscular action of the bronchial tubes and the muscular coats of the stomach and the diaphragm, in cases of asthma and vomiting: thus, in fact, acting antipathically, when given in such doses as to prostrate muscular power. If you proceed cautiously with ipecacuanha and antimony, you may make them into beautiful sedatives of muscular action, and thus act both on the muscular coats of the stomach and intestines; and on the diaphragm and heart in many cases, such as pneumonia, gastritis, diarrhœa, &c.; but in these cases the remedy is truly antipathic. It directly contradicts the action of the muscles which is going on, and the action of which muscles, such as the heart in pneumonia, is keeping up a good deal of the mischief.

We have been a good deal interested and amused to see these singular mistakes of the homœopaths respecting the real power and specific action of medicines.

We come, then, to the conclusion, that in nearly all, if not all, diseases, there are the attempts of nature, or a wonderful conservative power of the constitution to correct something which is interfering with the regular working of its machinery. In many of those attempts nature will do the work herself—in others she is over-doing the work, and in others she is coming short; so that in the first case the medical man must let her alone; in the second he must arrest or regulate her; in the third he must assist her. This, we think, is the GREAT PRINCIPLE OF MEDICINE, which we can discern, but which, as yet, we cannot work out completely in all cases. Our duty is to investigate the first commencement of diseases of every kind, and to see how nature proceeds in her work; we have also to see how she works in perfect health, and next endeavour to take our lessons of practice from her own proceedings. We can, however, discern so much in this, that in many cases she has to be checked or arrested, in others assisted, and in others let alone. We consider that the practice of homœopathy is simply the last, viz., *to let her alone*. A man has imbibed the poison of typhus fever, his blood is poisoned by some unknown material, and becomes decomposed, and its corpuscles broken up, so that they escape in some measure through the sides of the blood-vessels; blood oozes out upon the internal surfaces of the body. Nature will get rid of the poison if the patient live long enough, but you must *help* her to keep the patient alive with ammonia, wine, brandy, and food. Or, in another case, the man is labouring under violent suffering from undigested food in the stomach, giving rise to all kinds of symptoms. The stomach cannot relieve itself, although it tries hard to do so. You give a gentle emetic of ipecacuanha, or mustard and water, and the relief

is rapid. In these cases you assist nature. In others you arrest her. For example, the inflammation in the lungs is from a bad cold; the blood has been driven from the skin and has collected in the lungs, the heart sets to work to pump the blood back again to the skin, but in doing so it has first to go through the lungs, which are already too full. The attempts of nature here are well meant, but they are misapplied. You arrest or regulate her. You give small doses of ipecacuanha so as to nauseate the patient, and thus temporarily to *weaken* the force of the heart. The heart, by so doing, does not act so powerfully. It sends less blood to the gorged lungs, and you have time to draw the blood to the skin by perspiration.—Or, perhaps the patient's bowels have been violently irritated by large doses of fruit in autumn. Nature carries off the irritating material, but cannot stop herself in the purging which she has caused. The case, therefore, ends in cholera or dysentery. You must, then, check nature. Give a little ipecacuanha to stay the violent action of the muscular coat of the bowels, and a little opium to modify or check its irritability, and you will soon cure the case.

Or, lastly, the man has simply got a bad cold and is very feverish. You put him to bed, strike off all high food, and give him one drop of water every two or three hours. This last method is homœopathy in infinitesimal doses!

This subject is so interesting, and throws such light on the unscientific character of homœopathic practice that we will dwell a little more upon it. The nature of disease is not sufficiently understood. It is this misunderstanding which gives the public such a mistaken idea as to the nature and effects of medicines. It is supposed that disease is necessarily a destructive process, which seizes on the body, and which must in the end destroy it, or at least the portion which is attacked. This is a mistake; almost all diseases which we can see and examine, are, in reality, attempts of the body to overcome some secret and unseen action or poison, which is working or existing in the system. Disease, in fact, as manifested to our senses, is nothing more than a deficiency or excess of a natural and wholesome operation.* In some cases we cannot explain this satisfactorily, but in other cases we can see the beauty of this explanation, and no doubt as our knowledge increases we shall be able to carry the illustration further. For example,† a man is attacked by a tumour in his eye, and the eye is gradually pushed out and spoiled; when examined, it is found that a parasitic animal (an hydatid) is within the diseased portion, and has given rise to all the mischief. But the eye bursts, and the animal is got rid of. The same thing may go on in the liver, where it cannot be got rid of so easily, as the patient often dies during

* When we use the term "Disease" it must be understood in the sense in which we have endeavoured to explain it in a previous page.

† We take some of these ideas from Mr. Simon's work on Pathology, published by Renshaw, Strand.

the process. In common itch, an insect is seen burrowing in the skin, and causing an eruption; or a vegetable may be growing on the skin, as in porrigo, causing a tiresome skin disease. In all these cases you seem to have what is called disease going on, but it is the body which is struggling against the attacks of animals or vegetables; it is doing its best to get rid of them.—Or, another man may appear to have disease of the kidneys or bladder. He may be making bloody urine in small quantity—the real mischief is that the kidneys cannot throw off the increased quantity of *urea* which is existing in the blood, and the man is being poisoned by it.—Or, two men may be making an immense quantity of urine—in the one we find sugar, as in diabetes, in the other turpentine, which the man has been taking as a medicine; but the symptoms are similar, and nothing more than an effort of nature to get rid of substances which are only intruders.

It is wonderful how well nature works to right the system when anything attempts to disorder it. She makes the strongest efforts to maintain the original *type* which the Almighty has given to it, and when anything attempts to destroy this type of construction and chemical constitution, she tries to recover it. If you bend a bit of whalebone or stick, it resists your force as well as it can, and will make strong efforts to resume its original shape when your hand is taken off. So in disease, the body *resists* offending causes, tries of itself to counteract them, and invites the physician or surgeon to assist her. If he refuse to assist her, she will often do it alone. “You have a type of shape for every part of the body, a type for the hand, for the face, for the brain, for the leg—a type of texture for organs, for nerve, for cartilage, for bone, for blood, bile, urine, sweat.”—(*Simon's Pathology*.) In short, disease is generally nothing more than a modification of healthy action either in excess or deficiency. In the first you have to arrest or check it, in the latter to increase or excite it. For example, in cyanosis the child is blue because the heart has been arrested in its development, and in hypertrophy the development has gone too far; in hare-lip, again, the part was arrested in its growth; and in old men the cartilage which gave rise to their elasticity in youth has become bone—but it is only in obedience to the laws of nature, you cannot call it disease.

When we view disease in the light which we have been attempting to explain, we cannot but be struck with the laws of preservation which the Almighty has implanted in the organs of his creatures. He has not simply created these organs, and left them to take their chance, but he has implanted such a wonderful power in each organ to preserve its own shape and function, that even after what is called an attack of severe disease, it will make strong efforts to recover its original *type* of shape, texture, and function. So, to use the beautiful words of Mr. Simon, “We find that disease works according to laws definite, constant, invariable; we find in it no contradiction to the laws of life; on the contrary, that the latter, in their simplicity and

comprehensiveness, include and account for it; that the power of adaptation to circumstances, the power of resistance to casualties, the power of repair after injuries, would not be possible or conceivable attributes of the human body, except under conditions which impose the liability to disease. At every turn of the subject, and in every fresh illustration which new study reveals to us, we derive deeper and more steadfast convictions of the total absence of caprice, chance, or irregularity, even in the strongest influences of disease. We become habitual observers of that mystery which most of all tends to chasten and to elevate the mind—observers, namely, of the unbroken uniformity which prevails in the operation of natural laws. Standing, in the daily exercise of our profession, amidst an apparent chaos of darkness and suffering, where at first all seems, as of yore, to be ‘without form and void,’ it is our great privilege, that, by the aid of scientific insight, we are raised to a recognition of the ‘Spirit which moves upon the face of the waters,’ and which, now, as in the first morning of creation, resolves that chaos into harmonious order, that darkness into intelligible light, that suffering into the feeble counterpoise of some greater and more extensive good.” (*Simon’s Pathology*, p. 17.)

Nature, in fact, works from a model. There is nothing more interesting than to observe nature in her processes both in health and disease. You have a child in infancy totally unlike its elder brothers, but watch its growth and you will see it gradually assuming the *type* of the family; particle by particle is added to its body, feature to feature, till the growth is completed; and then say whether the living statue has not been copied from another statue by a wonderful *sculptor*. In fact nature is the sculptor, and she has worked after a model with mysterious but correct power. So in disease, a part is disorganized by what is called disease, but nature is still the sculptor. She has not forgotten her model; she replaces the lost or disordered portion by parts which she models as nearly as possible like the original parts. She often fails, but her efforts are beautiful; and in some of the lower animals she quite succeeds. In these, a limb may be taken off and she will replace it by a new one resembling the original. It is the same effort all through the human body, which we call the conservative power of nature, an attempt to recover the original type, which disease may be attempting to destroy. We perceive this in the more severe, as well as in mild disorders. The disordered operations, then, of the human body are generally nothing more than its attempts to regain the path of health from which some cause has caused it to swerve; nature often succeeds without any aid—at other times she fails. The art of the physician is to watch her efforts, to *assist*, to *check*, or to *modify* them according to the best of his judgment.

Diseases attack the body either from without or within. For example, malarious poisons from without, or poisons formed within the body itself. They are known by their symptoms

and effects, such as venous congestion, or dropsy from heart disease. The internal organs are like the crew of a ship in a storm, and instantly attempt to avert or throw off disease when it approaches. The storm may rage and the ship may give symptoms of the danger. The sails may be rent, the masts may crack, the deck may be flooded, and the fire of the engine may be damped. These are *necessary* symptoms and effects of the storm. But observe the crew : the sails are regulated, the steam of the engine is got up, the pilot is at the helm, and the compass is watched. These symptoms or effects are *not necessarily* connected with the storm. They are only an increase of the activity and watchfulness of the crew, which exist when there is no storm at all. To generate, or simulate, or aggravate the symptoms which are necessarily connected with the storm is a *bungling* kind of way of getting out of it ; but to regulate the symptoms or activity of the crew, and to direct those symptoms or operations *which are not necessarily connected with the storm*, but which may exist at all times, is a beautiful and scientific object. Let the captain (the physician) therefore, *direct the crew*, furl or unfurl the *sails*, *get up the steam*, *pump the water* from the ship, keep her guided by the compass, avoid the rocks and shoals on all sides, *retreat or advance her according to circumstances*, and in 96 cases out of every hundred you will save the vessel. We must therefore be careful to distinguish between *the symptoms or effects of a disease*, and *those natural and conservative powers which throw off disease*, but which are not necessary accompaniments nor symptoms of the real disease, as these last symptoms, which we may call *conservative symptoms*, exist in the body at all times, even in a state of health. *The symptoms of disease can only exist as the consequence of disease. The conservative symptoms or powers can and do exist independent of disease. To increase or generate symptoms similar to the disease is only increasing the mischief. To assist or regulate the conservative powers, so as to throw off the disease, is a beautiful and scientific principle, and worthy of a noble profession. It is an attempt to imitate those laws which the Almighty has placed in the body for its preservation. This we consider to be the true principle of medicine, and is gradually exalting the principles of medicine into a true science.*

To prescribe for *symptoms*, therefore, and especially to endeavour to regenerate a similar set of *diseased* symptoms, is to sail across the Atlantic without a magnet, and simply to accommodate the ship to the wind. What would be thought of a man who attempted to cure a child's legs which had become bowed and crooked for the want of lime in the bones, by applying irons or supports to his legs, but neglected to give the child phosphate of lime to strengthen his bones. Simply to apply artificial support would be called *empirical*. prescribing for symptoms without a real principle to guide us ; but to give the lime is a scientific thing. The same principle applies to spinal diseases. We might go on for pages illustrating the error and want of real

science, and even danger, of thus mistaking *symptoms* for *disease*. No doubt the most scientific man is often at a loss how to account for the symptoms before him, and, when so, he must submit to the humiliation of confessing that he can only make use of an *Art*, and prescribe for his patient according to what experience has taught him to have been useful in similar cases. But this empirical method is fast disappearing from amongst all well-informed medical men, and *art* is rapidly giving way to *science*.

In the previous remarks we have shown what an excellent physician Nature is, and that the recovery of a patient from sickness is no proof that the medicine given was the cause of the recovery. It may have been useful or not; but when we hear a patient say that he was attacked by illness, and recovered *after* taking certain globules or certain drops like water, and *therefore* his recovery must have been owing to these remedies, we are struck with the ignorance both of the patient and his medical adviser respecting the nature of disease, and respecting the wonderful powers of the constitution to throw off illness, even when unassisted by curative means. It reminds us of the sailor who whistles for a fair wind and if the wind becomes favourable *after* his whistle, he has the impression that the whistle caused the wind to change,—it is the common "*post hoc propter hoc*" argument.

Success in medical practice does not necessarily prove the truth of a professed principle, unless we can be absolutely certain that the principle is strictly adhered to. There is nothing more common than for one physician to be more successful in his cases than his neighbour; both may be professing the same *principles*, but each differs from the other in his *practice*: in short, success in practice depends not only on a good knowledge, but on a certain ability, or talent, or *tact*, to bring that knowledge into exercise, so if a homœopathic physician likes, he can treat his cases either homœopathically or allopathically, or in any way he thinks fit, and all the time pretend to be a homœopathist. His homœopathy may be made a cloak to do just as he likes. Medicines are now made in so concentrated a form, that a drop or two may be a full dose. This may appear to the unprofessional man to be an infinitesimal dose, when given in a glass of water; but in fact, it is a full dose, and quite as large a one as a regular physician would himself give. Aconitina, Strychnia, Nicotine, Morphia, Atropine, are the essences of Aconite, Nux Vomica, Tobacco, Opium, and Belladonna, which every regular physician may use; but if he wished to appear somewhat wonderful, he might drop a very small quantity into a wineglass or tumbler and give it to his patient, with good effect—yet, he would in fact, be giving a full dose of the medicine. The dose might *appear* to be a homœopathic infinitesimal dose, but it would *appear* to be what it was *not*,—it would be a good dose. So that when homœopaths appear to be giving their infinitesimal doses, they may be doing so only in *appearance*. If a homœopathic physician practised in any way that he thought fit, and used any

medicine whatever, without any respect to his principles, (all of which things he might do with the outward form of homœopathy,) and if, at the same time, he were of equal or superior natural ability to his allopathic neighbours, we don't see but that he might be equally successful. But there would be this difference, that the homœopath would be practising with a certain degree of deceit, and using the term homœopathy as a cloak to carry on his practices. It is this conduct which we look upon with dislike, and particularly so, when, at the same time, the homœopathic physician advertises himself as carrying out a *New System*, founded on *New Principles*. The whole thing is considered by the body of regular surgeons and physicians as, to say the least, discreditable to a body of properly educated men.

Let us next examine more particularly the principles of homœopathy, and compare the *modes of treatment* adopted by the homœopath and the scientific practitioner. The homœopath, we repeat, prescribes for the *symptoms* of a disease—the scientific practitioner prescribes for the cause of these symptoms, or tries to *regulate the conservative powers* of the constitution. Toothache is a symptom of a decayed tooth. Whether is it better to prescribe medicine to relieve the pain, or to attack the cause and extract the tooth at once? The homœopath would give medicine which, in a healthy man, would cause symptoms similar to toothache; the scientific practitioner would extract the tooth. The homœopath, when called upon to relieve a neuralgic pain, would give a medicine, if he could find one, to cause similar symptoms in a healthy man; the scientific practitioner would remove the cause if he could find it, and if he could not, he could easily relieve the pain by opium, or morphia, or aconite, or belladonna, and better still in most cases, by chloroform, either gently inhaled, or applied to the surface. All these medicines have a remarkable power of relieving pain, but they will not cause it when used in infinitesimal doses, nor in any doses at all—and yet homœopaths use these medicines in violation of what they call an infallible law or principle.

The great principle of homœopathy is, that whatever medicine given to a healthy man will cause in him symptoms similar to any disease, that medicine will cure the disease in the sick man. But is this the fact? Hahnemann states that Peruvian bark cures ague, because, when given to the healthy man, it causes symptoms similar to ague. This we deny altogether. How many people take quinine (made from bark) both in small and large doses, and we never hear of them having symptoms of ague! It is a curious fact, that when a person goes into a district infected with the poison of ague and other malarious fevers, he is nearly proof against all the symptoms if he take quinine for a certain time before he goes into the district, and for 14 days after he leaves it. This is well exemplified in a report lately issued by the expedition just returned from the Niger river, as will be seen at p. 648 of the *Lancet*, Dec. 18, 1858.* It is not a fact,

* Dr. Livingstone, in his present expedition in Africa, does not find the same power in quinine to avert malarious fever. (*See Med. Times and Gazette*, Nov. 12, 1859, p. 473.)

therefore, that Peruvian bark produces symptoms of ague in the healthy man, but *just the reverse*—it prevents all symptoms from even showing themselves.

You could not have a more forcible example of the difference of treatment between one system and another than in the subjoined case of the treatment of tetanus. Tetanus, or lock-jaw, consists in the rigidity of almost all the muscles of the body; it can be accurately simulated by giving a healthy man strychnine. The symptoms of poisoning by strychnine are exceedingly similar to the symptoms of lock-jaw. The homœopath ought, therefore, to have a certain remedy in strychnine. Exactly the reverse is the case, strychnine aggravates the symptoms, and was obliged to be given up; but aconite was found to cure. Now aconite prostrates and relaxes muscles, and never contracts them. In one of our previous volumes will be found a case in which chloroform was useful in relieving convulsions, and another case in which tobacco or nicotine was used with success in tetanus or lock-jaw. But all these remedies are exactly the opposite to strychnine, and every candid homœopathist must at once acknowledge that his principles are completely broken down before such examples of cases. The subjoined is an extract of the case treated by strychnine and aconite. It will be found in detail at p. 70 of the 39th volume of our *Retrospect*. Henry Blackwin, aged 15, was attacked by tetanus, Sept. 16, 1858, and admitted into the Middlesex Hospital. His symptoms became more marked in two days, and were gaining ground. One tenth of a grain of strychnine was given every two hours, and continued in varied doses till the 20th, when "the symptoms were now becoming so urgent that the strychnine treatment could not be longer tried. It was evident that though it was producing its own specific effect, the paroxysms of the disease were in no way relieved, nor were the chronic spasms at all diminished." (p. 72, *Retrospect*, vol. 39.) The patient was now put upon aconite in five minim doses every two hours, with an aconite liniment; this was assisted by an ointment of one part of extract of belladonna with two parts of opium rubbed into the thighs; "from this time the improvement was progressive, the countenance becoming more natural and the pain and anxiety diminishing." Another case is related in which the effects of aconite were still more marked; so much so, that by this medicine, "during the continuance of the disease, though at times he was alarmingly affected by the medicine, the severe tetanic symptoms were constantly subdued." (vol. 39, p. 74.) Another good case of recovery from lock-jaw (see *Retrospect*, vol. 38, p. 44) is given by Mr. Simon. Here nicotine (made from tobacco) was used. See also vol. 36, p. 38, where Dr. Hobart, of Cork, points out its value in tetanus, and also as an antidote to strychnine.

These cases of cure of lock-jaw by aconite, belladonna, and nicotine, are quite sufficient to overthrow all the arguments in the world, based on the theory that "like cures like." Here are cases fairly cured by

remedies, the specific effects of which are quite *dissimilar* from the disease. In lock-jaw we have the muscles rigid and contracted—the effect of aconite is to relax muscles; the same more especially is the effect of tobacco or nicotine, and belladonna. Make a person sick with tobacco, and see his relaxed and sickly frame—quite the opposite to rigidity—and yet this remedy cures lock-jaw, in which strychnine has been proved to fail. Yet strychnine produces symptoms very similar to lock-jaw, and ought to cure it if homœopathy be correct.

If one thing more than another could convince us of the error of homœopathy, it would be the use of aconite by homœopaths; perhaps the most powerful and favourite medicine which they use. They call it “*the Homœopathic lancet*, as it is the *great remedy for inflammation*.” Dr. Sharp says that it is “a most valuable remedy in simple and inflammatory fever. It must entirely banish the use of the lancet, the leech, and the blister, in such cases.” “In its relation to inflammatory fever it stands at present unrivalled.” (*Tract*, No. 10, pp. 12, 13.) We agree with these remarks in many respects. It is a most valuable medicine. It is not duly appreciated nor understood. Nay, even the homœopaths themselves are at downright *loggerheads* respecting it. Mr. Everest, a zealous homœopath and friend of Hahnemann, says, that a true application of the doctrine of homœopathy “excludes the use of aconite in almost every case in which it is now employed by homœopathists.” Mr. Everest further says, “I assure you seriously, that absurd as the old system is, it is not more injurious than this, viz., homœopathy as practised by British homœopathic physicians and amateurs.” This contradiction is amusing: but we here quite agree with Mr. Everest, that the use of aconite by modern homœopaths is a direct contradiction of all their principles! For what is aconite? Let any candid homœopath refer to Dr. Fleming’s Monograph on this medicine, the best work ever written on Aconite. Dr. Fleming says, “that its primary action on the nervous system is purely *sedative* in its nature from the first, and the closest scrutiny fails to detect any symptom calculated to warrant the belief that a primary stimulant action is exerted.” Again, he says, that its action on the circulation is also sedative; “when this is fully developed, the flow of arterial blood to the brain is much diminished, an occurrence which impairs the energies of that organ, *in the same way as excessive loss of blood*; between which, and the action of aconite, there exists a very strong analogy.” “The action of aconite on the *muscular system* is directly and powerfully sedative. (*Fleming on Aconite*, p. 26, 30.) These are not simple opinions, but are founded on a series of experiments of the most interesting kind;—and yet, here is a remedy of a most sedative character used by homœopaths in fevers, inflammations, &c., as a substitute for the lancet, leeches, &c. They could not possibly have used a more *antipathic* or *allopathic* remedy! Let them candidly consider this, and acknowledge it. Don’t let them *pick out* one or two solitary symptoms from amongst nume-

ous others, which might seem to support their views, but let them take the general character of the medicine. In some medicines, when taken as poisons, you may have numerous symptoms of an anomalous character, and it is easy to select some of those symptoms so as to appear to give support to their views ; but aconite, if viewed fairly, must decidedly contradict their principles.

We will give one more illustration, to show the error and danger of treating *symptoms* instead of the *disease*—*effects* instead of the *cause*. Apoplexy is caused by the rupture of a blood-vessel in the brain, and the blood escaping into the parts around the blood-vessel. Among the most important symptoms, we have what is called *coma*, a kind of stupor, with snoring and insensibility, resembling a man who is intoxicated, or one who has taken a large dose of opium. Both opium and alcohol, therefore, ought to be the homœopathic remedies. But how dangerous to use them in a man whose blood-vessels are already overloaded. When a water-pipe has burst in the street, and is deluging the surrounding earth with water, whether is it better to send more water along the pipe or to cut off the supply from the main-pipe or reservoir ? The homœopathic remedies, opium and alcohol, if used at all, would send the blood still more to the broken bloodvessel—the lancet of the surgeon would stop the supply. We do not say that the homœopath *would* use opium and alcohol ; we only say that as these agents produce symptoms in the healthy man resembling the coma of apoplexy, they *ought* to be the homœopathic remedies for such a state. Again, you see a man's eye angry and inflamed—you can produce this condition, the same as in the brain of an apoplectic patient, by giving opium or brandy : but, next time your own eye is bloodshot and inflamed, try a dose of opium or brandy, and see if it does not greatly aggravate the case. The next time your eye is in the same state, try cold water applied to it, take a little ipecacuanha to make you sickly, and thus to diminish the force of the heart, and the rush of blood to the eye, at the same time keep in a dark room, so as to keep off the stimulating effects of light ; and strike off the supply of food, so that the quantity of blood made may be rapidly diminished, and see what effect this will have upon your eye.—You will soon see the difference of treatment, and be convinced of the error of homœopathy, and that after all the *old system* is not to be condemned.

When, however, we find in the standard works of homœopathy that common salt is said to cause 450 symptoms, oyster shell 1090 symptoms, the ink of the cuttle fish 1242 symptoms, common charcoal 930 symptoms, and that therefore all these symptoms of the medicines may be a guide to us in applying them to disease, we naturally shut the book, shrug our shoulders, and confess that we cannot argue any more with such people !

You cannot have a much better example how beautifully what may be called antipathic or allopathic treatment is illustrated, than in the treatment of acute rheumatism. Every one knows what the *symp-*

toms of rheumatism are; but the *symptoms* are not the *disease*, and however accurately you may be able to resemble rheumatism by giving medicines so as to generate similar symptoms, you will not cure it by this treatment. Now what is rheumatism? It is essentially a blood disease. The blood is found to contain a more than usual quantity of what is called *fibrin*, a material which chiefly composes, surrounds, and packs up all the joints, so as to strengthen them. This same material also exists in the valves and other tissues of the heart. Now, just look at the way in which nature or the powers of the constitution try to get rid of this *fibrin*, which is circulating in the blood to its great annoyance.—The joints are chiefly composed of this material: the joints during their growth in childhood constantly absorb this material for their sustenance and increase. They continue to do so all through life, and therefore, when there is an unusual quantity in the blood, they are expected to absorb an increased quantity, in order to relieve the blood. This they do, and it is this process, always aggravated by fatigue, which brings on the *symptoms*, pains in the joints, muscles, and tendons. But the heart itself is also a kind of large joint, and does the same work. The heart, therefore, is liable to the same disease. Now you certainly might *try* to treat this case homœopathically, and *attempt* to produce pain in the joints, or a heart disease, but in the first place you would fail, and in the second place, supposing even that you succeeded, you would aggravate the mischief already done, not because nature's removal of the fibrine is wrong, but because it is done in a manner which, though curing the rheumatic state of blood, injures the joints and heart. But if you give salts of potash, or bicarbonate of soda combined with nitre, you *dissolve* this fibrine in the blood, and wash it out through the kidneys, thus getting rid of the evil at once, and very rapidly curing the case.* Now we would ask the candid homœopathist if he can reconcile this with his creed. You might give potash and soda for ever and you would never produce symptoms of rheumatism—and you would never produce fibrine in the blood by giving these medicines. On the other hand, potash and soda directly and immediately dissolve the fibrine. They are beautiful antipathic or allopathic remedies. We do not by any means intend to say that excess of fibrine in the blood is the only change in that fluid pathognomonic of rheumatism, nor that alkalies act only by diminishing the excess.

Consider the danger of homœopathy to individuals attacked by disease, who have not been previously experimented upon *in health*, as to the effects of medicines. A person is attacked by disease; he sends for the homœopathic physician, medicines are prescribed and given; but who knows what are to be the effects? One great prin-

* See *Guy's Hospital Reports*, vol. v, 1859; and the present vol., p. 27.

ciple of homœopathy is, that every medicine must have its powers and effects tried on *healthy* people. But every healthy man differs more or less from another, and no medicine has the same effect on two or more individuals. But the patient's life is in danger, and may terminate in a very short time. In this dilemma, the physician must give medicines which he has only tried on *other* individuals: in order to be effectual they ought to have been previously tried on the patient himself *whilst in health*. This is one of the chief principles of the doctrine, and, consequently, when brought into practice at the bed-side, will almost always prove a broken reed to depend upon. The principle might be worth arguing if the same medicine had always the same effect on all individuals, but as it has hardly the same effects on any two people it is worth nothing. Even if the drug had a tolerably similar effect on twenty people, but not on the next five, it would be a great misfortune for one of the five to be attacked by a disease for which the remedy was quite inapplicable; and supposing that his life was at stake, we should consider it a dangerous principle to be depended upon.

Consider, also, the danger of trusting to this system of medicine under the following circumstances: "To effect a mild, rapid, certain, and permanent cure, choose, in every case of disease a medicine which can itself produce an affection similar to that sought to be cured." (*Dr. Dudgeon.*) You may generate *symptoms*, but you cannot generate the artificial disease which is to resemble the real disease. No homœopath has ever yet pretended to generate *diseases* by means of medicines similar to certain original diseases. What medicines can generate *diseases* similar to mitral valve disease; to a clot of blood on the brain from a ruptured vessel, as in apoplexy; to amaurosis or cataract of the eye; to the effusion of lymph or fibrin, as in croup; to a stone in the kidney or bladder, or to worms in the bowels; or to numerous other real diseases? You may attempt to generate some of the *symptoms*, but these are not the disease, and may exist in quite different diseases. To generate a symptom without also generating a disease is useless; the real cause of the artificial symptoms you generate is nothing more than a poison acting in certain ways on different parts, but very little resembling disease. But if you *could* generate an artificial disease resembling the real one, woe be to the patients labouring under numerous diseases, the least increase or aggravation of which would be destruction to them,—such as a fatty blood-vessel in the brain ready to burst; a thin heart also ready to burst; an amaurotic eye, nearly blind; an ulcer of the cornea, just ready to penetrate that structure; an aneurismal tumour; a blood-vessel in the lungs ready to burst; an ulcer in the stomach or bowels, &c. &c. It must be remembered that in all these and numerous other cases, in which life hangs on a thread, the homœopathic principle is that the artificial disease or symptoms will at first

rather increase the original ones. There will, in fact, be an aggravation of symptoms for a time, and this slight aggravation will soon decide the matter in many diseases. We must protest solemnly against the practice of such a principle in the treatment of disease, and hold those who do practice it as responsible for many grievous mistakes both in the diagnosis and treatment of disease.

The homœopathist says, that one great difference between his system, and what he calls the old system, is, that the medicines which he gives he first tries on himself; whereas, in the *old* system these are first tried on the patient. This is a misrepresentation. We deny altogether that the homœopath first tries all his medicines on *himself*—his system depends almost entirely on the effects of medicines on *others*. Dr. Sharp, who has particularly stated the above doctrine, informs us that the reason why belladonna is effectual in scarlet fever is, that “Belladonna, when swallowed as a poison, produces a scarlet rash, a sore throat, fever, headache, &c., all which symptoms appear in scarlet fever.” He likewise states, in another page, that “The homœopathic physician learns the properties of drugs by experiments upon himself, not upon his patients.” Let this gentleman say whether his assertion is to be depended upon. Has he tried belladonna in these doses upon himself? Has he tried the effects of all the medicines which he uses on himself? If not, is it worthy of him to make such an assertion to the disadvantage of those who disagree from him? Moreover, we assert that belladonna is very variable in its effects, and does *not* always produce the symptoms above-mentioned; it is even said that it produces these symptoms very rarely. We have been accustomed to prescribe belladonna for thirty years, and we never yet knew this drug to produce the symptoms above-mentioned. It is not the rule certainly; we could give many instances in which this effect was absent. The reader will find some very interesting cases of this kind related by Dr. Fuller. In several cases of chorea in which this medicine was given in large doses, (70 grains daily to one girl of 10 years old, or 1·019 grains in 26 days; to another girl, aged 14, atropine 37 grains in 18 days), no bad effects whatever followed, and “in no instance was there any feverish heat, or any *rash* or erythematous blush on the skin.” (*Brit. Med. Journal*, Aug. 27, 1859, p. 704.) From some cause or other there was great *tolerance* of this medicine in these cases, but they were cases of convulsions. We mention the fact, however, simply to prove that belladonna does not counteract scarlatina, owing to what are called its homœopathic virtues, as these virtues or effects are very exceptional. And, by the bye, many of these cases of chorea were relieved by the belladonna. Now chorea is a convulsive disease, and the effect of belladonna is to *relax* muscular action—in fact, a direct opponent to spasm or convulsion. In chorea, therefore, it was beneficial as an *allopathic* and not as an *homœo-*

pathic remedy. The homœopath may say that in the above cases that disease existed, and therefore you could not judge of the remedy. In other cases, however, referred to in the same paper, it was given experimentally, but cautiously, to healthy children and adults, and still we find no rash produced.

One of the laws or principles of homœopathy is, that when a disease exists in the body, it can be cured by another disease with similar symptoms, provided the latter be stronger than the former, or, in the words of Hahnemann, "INVARIABLY, and in every case, do two diseases, differing certainly in kind, but very *similar* in their phenomena and effects, and in the sufferings and symptoms they severally produce, ANNIHILATE ONE ANOTHER, whenever they meet in the organism; the stronger disease, namely, annihilates the weaker." As an example of this law, the homœopaths state that an attack of small-pox destroys cow-pox. "*Small-pox coming on after vaccination, as well on account of its greater strength as its great similarity, IMMEDIATELY REMOVES ENTIRELY the Cow-pox homœopathically, and does not permit it to come to maturity; but, on the other hand, the Cow-pox when near maturity does, on account of its great similarity, homœopathically diminish very much the supervening Small-pox, and make it much milder, as Mühry (in Robert Willan, on "Vaccination") and many others testify.*" (*Organon*, p. 148.) This assertion of Hahnemann shows how carelessly and incorrectly some of his boldest opinions and matters of fact are adduced in proof of what he wishes to be believed. Will the reader believe it, that what Hahnemann here states is perfectly incorrect, and that Robert Willan, our celebrated English writer, asserts exactly the opposite? Dr. Willan's words (in his work on *Vaccine Inoculation*, p. 3.) are, 1. "That when a person was inoculated with vaccine and variolous matter *about the same time*, both inoculations proved effective; for the VACCINE VESICLE PROCEEDED TO ITS ACME in the usual number of days, and the maturation of the variolous pustule was attended with a pustular eruption on the skin. 2. That these effects took place, without much variation, in all cases where the interval between the two inoculations *did not exceed a week*; but, 3. That when variolous matter was inserted on the *ninth* day after the vaccine inoculation, its action seemed to be wholly precluded," (the system being now sufficiently fortified against it by the due protecting effects of cow-pox). So much for this opinion of Hahnemann, which proves just the contrary to what he states. We must do Dr. Sharp, of Rugby, justice in stating that he dissents from these extraordinary fallacies of the founder of his creed. He says, "Truly never was hypothesis based upon more slender materials; never did assertion and inadequate proof appear more conspicuously side by side than in these paragraphs?" We wish this estimable and talented writer had been

equally discerning to find out the other fallacies of his system. We still hope to see such a mind as his candidly acknowledging its errors.

Another principle of homœopathy is, that the effects of a remedy must not be *identical* with, but "as similar as possible" to the disease, or, in exact words, "In order," says he, that "the artificial diseases producible by medicines, may effect a cure, it is before all things requisite, that they should be capable of producing in the human body an *artificial disease*, AS SIMILAR AS POSSIBLE to the disease to be cured, in order, by means of this similarity, conjoined with the somewhat greater strength, to substitute themselves for the natural morbid affection, and thereby deprive the latter of all influence upon the vital force." (*Organon*, p. 133.)

The example adduced to support this law is, that if a person has on his skin an herpetic or miliary eruption, and he be attacked by measles, the measles cures the previous disease. But we perceive very little similarity between measles and herpes, or measles and a miliary eruption. We might as well say that small-pox and erysipelas resemble each other, because the skin is affected in both cases. Measles and herpes, if they counteract each other, do so for just the opposite reasons to what Hahnemann adduces. They counteract each other from their *dissimilarity*, and not on account of their *similarity*. This seems even to be the opinion of Hahnemann himself, for he goes on, curiously enough, to show how, in confirmation of his great principle of "like curing like," small-pox cures inflammation of the eye, amaurosis, deafness, difficulty of breathing, swelling of the testicles, and dysentery. It is almost laughable to see how the zeal of a man will mislead him. What similarity have the symptoms of small-pox to the above-named diseases? We should again say, they are as dissimilar as possible, and only prove the weakness of such an argument. These cases of Hahnemann prove what has long been known to us, that it is difficult for two diseases of any kind to exist at the same time in the human body, and much more difficult for diseases of a dissimilar, than of a similar kind to exist together.

The homœopathic law which states "It is not possible to perform a cure *but* by the aid of a remedy which produces symptoms similar to those of the disease itself," is daily contradicted, not only by cases met with by the scientific modern physician, but by the homœopathist himself: and the very instance brought forward, viz., that ague is cured by bark, *because* bark produces symptoms similar to ague in the healthy individual, is quite contradicted by every-day experience, as we noticed in a preceding page. If this principle were true, we must, to be successful, possess medicines which would in the healthy man produce symptoms similar to all the diseases of the body. Now many of these

diseases we *can* simulate by medicines, such as the coma of apoplexy by opium; the delirium of inflammation of the brain by alcohol, Indian hemp, &c.; inflammation of the eye by a drop of oil of vitriol; inflammation of the stomach by arsenic; inflammation of the kidneys by Spanish flies;—but we would ask any candid homœopath if these would be proper remedies for the diseases themselves? On the other hand, we should like to know what medicines given to a healthy man will produce symptoms of typhus fever, consumption, scrofula, cancer, and a host of other diseases—and if the above quoted dogma be true, and if we cannot produce these symptoms in the healthy man, then we do not possess any remedies for this host of diseases on the homœopathic principles. Moreover, facts are against this hypothesis, as, for example, in *sea scurvy*. You cannot by any known medicine produce the symptoms of sea scurvy in a healthy man, and especially not by lemon-juice,—but let a sailor be attacked by sea scurvy, and let him have lemon-juice, and you will soon see the good effects. Again, you cannot produce *goitre*, or swelled neck, in a healthy woman by any known medicine, and especially not by iodine,—but this is cured by iodine. It is urged, with apparent plausibility, that nitrate of silver causes inflammation in the healthy eye, and cures it in the diseased one:—but oil of vitriol, a bit of sand, a hot iron, caustic potash, violent winds, and many other things produce a similar kind of inflammation—but do not cure it. Inflammation of the eye consists in a *dilatation* or swelling of the blood-vessels, so that these vessels admit a larger quantity of blood than in health—nitrate of silver *contracts* these vessels and prevents all this blood from passing along them. The remedy, in fact, contradicts the disease so called—the disease is *dilatation*, the remedy is *contraction*; precisely the same as, in typhus fever, the disease is a poison prostrating the powers of the body,—the remedy is a stimulant, such as brandy or ammonia.

The assertions of homœopathic writers have no doubt shocked some of the more sensible disciples, but they prove that there is no unity either in the ranks or practice of this system. One writer says, “If the remedy given be homœopathically selected, it *will* cure in whatever dilution it may be administered.” (*Brit. Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. 5, p. 532.) So that, whether a drop of tincture of aconite be mixed with a hundred drops of water, or in a lake 250 miles square, it *will* cure, if selected homœopathically! But other writers and practitioners differ; for in the same work we find that with respect to doses, “There is no homœopathic question in which there exists greater discrepancy of opinion. In fact, we may almost say there are as many opinions as practitioners, and each is prepared to prove the superiority of his own by an imposing array of cases.” (*Ibid*, p. 257.)

This contradiction of opinions amongst homœopaths is equally strong with respect to the medicines used, as well as the doses. Thus, Hahnemann considered that aconite was chiefly useful in pure inflammatory fever, and one or two other disorders ; but others use it indiscriminately in chronic and acute diseases, and so commit, according to Mr. Everest, one of their disciples, "most extensive mischief." Thus, in Dr. Hempel's *Domestic Homœopathic Physician*, we find that aconite is used in almost all affections, "from nettle rash to consumption, from toothache to apoplexy, aconite is the principal, the best, the infallible remedy." Again, Hahnemann maintains that arsenic is the true specific for typhus, while Dr. Wurmb maintains that it is of use whatever in this disease.

The homœopath asserts that his medicines have not been fairly tried by the regular physician. This assertion is incorrect. There is not a more respectable man anywhere than M. Andral, of Paris. Dr. Marsden, a homœopathist, speaks of him as the "prince of physicians." M. Andral tried the system on 130 or 140 patients, in the presence of the homœopathists themselves. In describing the results, he said, "he was decidedly opposed to the project of allowing the homœopathists a dispensary : humanity should not be trifled with by the experiments of these people. He had given their system a fair trial ; he had treated above 130 or 140 patients homœopathically, *in presence of the Hahnemannians themselves*. M. Guibourt had prepared the medicines ; and *every* requisite care and precaution were duly observed : yet in not one instance was he successful. He had tried various experiments on his own person, and several other professional friends had followed his example, in order to ascertain the actual effects of the homœopathic doses ; but the results were not as Hahnemann and his disciples described them. He (M. Andral) had taken quinine in the prescribed globules, but had contracted no intermittent fever ; he had taken aconite, but without being affected with symptoms of plethora ; sulphur he took, to try if he should catch the itch, but he caught nothing ; neither, upon swallowing certain globules of *arnica*, did he feel pains as if he had suffered contusion : and so with various other substances which he and his friends took in obedience to the Hahnemannian precepts. "With respect to the attempt to cure disease by this method, he said that in every instance he was obliged to return to allopathy, inasmuch as under the homœopathic treatment the symptoms went on from bad to worse." (*Dr. Simpson*, p. 275.)

"A German homœopathist (observes Dr. Lee), practising in Russia, was invested by the Grand Duke Michael with full powers to prove, if possible, by a comparison of facts, the advantages of homœopathic measures over the ordinary modes of treatment ; and a certain number of patients in the wards of a military hospital were intrusted

to his care. At the expiration of two months, however, he was not permitted to proceed further. For, in comparing results, it was seen that within this period, out of 457 patients treated by the ordinary means, 364, or three-fourths, were cured, and none died ; whereas by the homœopathic method, tried on 128 patients, one half only were cured, and five had died." (*Dr. Lee's Homœopathy*, p. 26.) The Russian government, it is further stated by Dr. Lee, tried in two hospitals the comparative treatment of a number of patients with homœopathic globules, and a number of other patients with no drugs of any kind ; and the results were found very similar in both instances.

The medical council therefore recommended that the homœopathic treatment should be discontinued for the following reasons :—

"1. Acute diseases require energetic means of treatment, which are not to be expected from homœopathy. 2. The homœopathic treatment of external lesions and surgical diseases is altogether out of the question. 3. Some slight affections get well while under homœopathic treatment, but similar affections disappear equally well, without any medical treatment, by the adoption of an appropriate regimen, good air, and cleanliness." (*Dr. Lee's Homœopathy*, p. 27.)

At Naples, too, a commission was appointed to examine this system, and came to the conclusion—"1st. That the homœopathic treatment produced no effect. 2ndly. That it had the serious inconvenience, in several of the patients, of preventing the employment of remedies by which they might be cured." (*Ibid*, p. 29.)

Dr. Lee further states, at p. 20, "in looking over the history of several of the cases treated at the London Homœopathic Institution, I found, what might be anticipated, that they were very analogous to the above, viz., the ordinary slighter ailments usually met with in dispensary practice, which seldom require a long treatment, though most of the cases reported in the *Homœopathic Annals* required two, three, or four months attendance before the patients were dismissed." Again, "we have had, I think, sufficient proof that disorders and diseases are of much longer duration under the homœopathic than under appropriate allopathic treatment, and also, that in acute and serious diseases the mortality of patients homœopathically treated greatly exceed that of those treated by the ordinary appropriate means." (p. 21.)

In conclusion, therefore, we consider that homœopathy is unscientific in principle, and, as just shown, unsuccessful when applied to the treatment of disease, and leaves the case to the unaided powers of nature, sometimes even increasing the disease present, or entailing a lingering recovery.